AN ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS

Presented to the

MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH of *ENGLAND.*

LONDON:

Printed for **Ric. Chiswell**, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

UMI

AN ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS OF THE MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH of ENGLAND.

AN ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS

Presented to the

Ministers of the Church of *ENGLAND.*

An Address *Presented to the Reverend and Learned Ministers of the* Church of England, *by one sincerely desirous of finding out the Truth, in behalf of himself and others equally concern'd, as well for their own as the general Satisfaction.* Address.

IT's a hard Shift the present Writers of the Church of *Rome* among us, are brought to, that when other helps fail them, they take up with such a sort of Arguments, which how useful soever they may prove to make some men of Their Religion, have a plainer tendency to make others of None. *Answer.*

Certainly were these persons as much concerned for the Truth of Christianity, as they are for their own Corruptions of it; or could defend those Corruptions in a better way, they would not put the case upon this extre-

mity; and had they the Scripture as much for the Church of *Rome*'s Supremacy and Infallibility, &c. as it is for its own ſufficiency, the Trinity and Incarnation of our Bleſſed Saviour, we ſhould have heard more of their Proofs from Scripture, than of *Requeſts* and *Addreſſes* to the Church of *England* (the great Patron it ſeems of theſe Points) to prove from Scripture the Trinity and Incarnation.

Theſe Articles of the Chriſtian Faith are an Argument worthy of a ſerious Conſideration, if propoſed by one that really needs, as well as he pretends to deſire, Satisfaction. But to have a Member of the Church of *Rome* (as our Author apparently is) perſonating an *Arrian* and other Hereticks, and in the face of the World requiring Scripture-proof for thoſe above-ſaid Points of Catholick Doctrine: To have this thruſt upon us afreſh after the unrefuted Anſwers given to the Firſt *Requeſt*, the *Catholick Dialogue*, and the *Plea for a Socinian*, is no good ſign, whatever he pretends, *of one ſincerely deſirous of finding out the Truth*; nor would it be worth the while to take up the Cauſe anew for his ſake, who I am ſenſible is not to be ſatisfied in this way, were it not for ſome better End it may be uſeful to.

The *Addreſs* conſiſts of ſeveral Propoſals; which thus begin:

Addreſs. *There can be no doubt, but that the main Concern of Man in this Vale of Tears, is the Salvation of his Soul. If this be loſt, he loſes all; if this be gained, he gains all, and both for an Eternity. No body then can blame me, if being ſolicitous to ſave my Soul, I have recourſe to thoſe, whoſe Learning muſt needs enable them, and whoſe Charity cannot but incline them to inſtruct me in this weighty Affair.*

I therefore humbly beſeech you, moſt Reverend and Learned Doctors of the Church of England, *to afford me a clear and ſatisfactory Solution of theſe following Doubts.*

Firſt, *I deſire to know, Whether all things neceſſary to Salvation are contained in Scripture? If not, where muſt I ſeek them? If they be, then they are either clearly contained in it, ſo that there is no need of an Interpreter for the meaning of the words; or not. If there be no need of any ſuch Interpreter, then I humbly ask what theſe Neceſſaries to Salvation are, and in what Chapter and Verſe of Scripture each of them may be found. For example; Is the belief of a Trinity,* &c.

For the clearer underſtanding of the whole, I ſhall divide it into ſeveral Queſtions. *Anſwer.*

Q. 1. *Whether all things neceſſary to Salvation are contained in Scripture?*

A. If there are things neceſſary to Salvation that are not contained in Scripture, the World is, for ought I ſee, at a great loſs *where to ſeek them*: For nothing can be neceſſary to Salvation, which was not neceſſary in the Primitive, and will be ſo to all ſucceeding Ages. But where to find thoſe things thus neceſſary, out of Scripture, that have been of a date and Authority equal to it, I know none that have attempted the diſcovery: Nor could we ever yet be favoured with an account of *what theſe Neceſſaries are, and where each of them may be found.* So that Scripture muſt contain theſe Neceſſary things, or elſe we are left without any means of knowing them. And the Scripture muſt fail of its end, and we of the Salvation therein revealed, if that be not as ſufficient in its kind to beget Faith in us, as Faith is to ſave us. For ſaith St. *John* 20. 31. *Theſe things are written that ye might*

might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name. Nay, we are as much assured of this, as we are of its Divine Authority; for the same Apostle that saith, *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God*, doth immediately before as positively affirm, that *the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto Salvation*, 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16.

From which Consideration it was, that all doubts relating to Salvation were hereby to be resolved; which could not be, were not all things necessary to Salvation contained in it. So when that Question was put to our Saviour, *Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?* He answered, *What is written in the Law? How readest thou? Thou knowest the Commandments*, Luke 10. 25, 26. Mark 10. 17, 19. And that they had *Moses and the Prophets*, was in his estimation sufficient to dispose them to Repent, without any other Revelation than was therein contained, *Luke* 16. 29, 30, 31.

Till it can therefore be shewn, that the Scripture was not written to *make* men *wise unto salvation*; or that men might be wise to Salvation without knowing the things necessary to it: Till it can be proved that the *Old Testament* was not a Rule of Faith and Manners to the *Jews* in all points necessary to their Salvation; Or that both *Old* and *New-Testament* have not the same end, or not the same sufficiency to that End now to the Christian, as the *Old Testament* alone had to the Jewish Church; we have no reason to think the Scripture defective in any thing necessary to Salvation, or that there is any other means provided by God to supply its deficiency therein.

And in this Doctrine we are not alone, but have the concurrence of the most Authentick Writers of the Christian Church; of which sort in particular is that

memorable ſaying of St. *Auſtin*, *All things which concern Faith and Manners of Life, are found in thoſe things which are plainly contained in Scripture.* A Truth that the Writers of the Church of *Rome* in their ſoberer thoughts do often acknowledg. So *Antoninus* A. B. of *Florence*, *God*, ſaith he, *hath ſpoken but once, and that in the Holy Scripture, and that ſo fully as to meet with all temptations, and all caſes that may fall out, and all good works; that*, as Gregory *expounds it*, *he needs ſpeak no more to us concerning any Neceſſary matter, ſeeing all things are found in Scripture.*

De Doctr. Chriſt. l. 2. c. 9.

Sum. Part 3. Tit. 18. c. 3. ſ. 3.

Q. 2. *Whether all things neceſſary to Salvation are clearly contained in Scripture?*

It was, we have ſeen, the Opinion of St. *Auſtin*, that not only all things thus neceſſary are contained in Scripture, but alſo that they are *plainly* therein contained. And yet neither that Father nor any of the ſame mind with him (as who was not then, and who is not now, except the Church of *Rome?*) did ever thereby underſtand that all theſe Neceſſaries are expreſly contained in Scripture, ſince an evident Conſequence is equivalent to a plain and expreſs Propoſition; as it was *Matt.* 22. 31, 32. Nor 2. do they underſtand by being *clearly contained in Scripture*, that all perſons may *immediately* learn all Neceſſaries, by the *meer reading* of it (as our Author puts the Caſe) without the uſe of thoſe means for the underſtanding of it, that God has appointed, and the nature of the thing requires; ſuch as attention, conſideration, and the aſſiſtance of Teaching Guides. For the plainneſs or clearneſs of the things to be learned and underſtood, and an Inſtructor to lead us to or help us in the underſtanding them, are not only conſiſtent, but generally to be ſuppoſed. It's a good ſaying of one upon this Argu-

White's Way to the true Church. Sect. 8. N. 2.

ment; *That is not obscure, which by ordinary means may be apprehended; but that is so which either hath no means at all to open it, or hath such as are not ordinary.*

Neither 3. can it be supposed that the Scriptures do so *clearly* contain all things necessary, as that nothing of that kind ever was, or can be excepted against; For they may be plain, and yet for some prevalent reasons it may not be confessed. They may again be plain, and yet not be understood to be so from several Impediments.

Sometimes this proceeds from a natural Impediment, as it is in Children, and such as are of a very weak capacity. And yet even to such St. *Austin* supposes them to be intelligible, *God having bowed down the Scripture to the capacity of Babes and Sucklings, that when proud men will not speak to their capacity, he himself might.*

Enarrat. in ps. 8.

Sometimes from moral Impediments, such as prejudices and prepossessions, as it was with the Apostles who understood not our Saviour when he told them openly and plainly, again and again, that he *must be killed*, Mark 8. 31, 32. 9. 31, 32. Such again are vile affections, as Pride and the Love of the World, Interest and Obstinacy, into which our Saviour resolved the *Jews* Infidelity, *John* 5. 40, 44. Such are Partiality, Negligence, Sloth and Inconsideration.

There are also Judicial Impediments, when for their contempt and obstinacy, &c. God sends men *strong delusions, that they should believe a lye*, 2 Thes. 2. 10, 11.

But now where those and the like Impediments are not, but that men *lay aside all malice, and all guile and hypocrisy, and as new born babes*, in the Apostles Phrase, *desire the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby*, 1 Pet. 2. 1, 2. that they come with an honest heart, and use

a competent diligence, with a Dependance upon God's aſſiſtance for the *Wiſdom* he hath promiſed, I know nothing neceſſary to Salvation (unleſs what the Church of *Rome* hath made ſo) but what is plainly taught in Scripture, and may be learn'd from it. But without this temper the plaineſt and moſt expreſs words, and the neceſſary meaning of thoſe words will not convince ſome men.

As for Example, what more plain, than that in *Exodus* 20. there is a 2*d* Commandment diſtinct from the Firſt? What more plain, than *thou ſhalt not make to thee any graven Image, nor the likeneſs of any thing, to bow down before it, or worſhip it?* What more plain, than *drink ye all of it*, Matth. 26. 27. What more plain, than that Prayer is not to be in an *Unknown Tongue?* 1 Cor. 14. Laſtly, what more clear, than that *the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation?* And yet we know where theſe things will not be confeſs'd. The Truth is, that as long as there are Prejudices and Intereſt, and depraved Affections in mankind, Truth will be obſcure: And *the things that are eaſy, are yet to Hereticks hard to underſtand*, ſaith St. *Cyril*. But the defect in them, makes none in the Scripture, which is as entire, compleat, and clear, when men do diſagree about it, as when it is by all unanimouſly conſented to. In John l. 1. c. 4.

I ſhall ſum up what I have ſaid in the words of St. *Chryſoſtom*, who thus delivers himſelf upon this Argument, *The Scriptures are eaſy to underſtand, and expoſed to the capacity of every Servant and Plough-man, and Widow, and Boy, and him that is moſt unwiſe.* And again, *Therefore God penned the Scriptures by the hands of Publicans, Fiſher-men, Tent-makers, Shepherds, Neatherds, and unlearned Men, that none of the ſimple People* Homil. 1. in Math & Hom. 3 de Lat.

might have any excuſe from reading, and that ſo they might be eaſie to be underſtood of all men, the Artificer, the Houſholder, and Widow-woman, and him that is moſt unlearned: Yea the Apoſtles and Prophets, as School-maſters to all the world, made their Writings plain and evident to all men; ſo that every man of himſelf only, by reading them, might learn the things ſpoken therein.

If the Reader deſires further ſatisfaction, he may find it in a Learned Book newly publiſh'd, called, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature and Grounds of the certainty of Faith*, p. 40, 80, 81, *&c.*

Q. 3. *What are theſe Neceſſaries to Salvation?*

Our Author offers Three Inſtances of ſuch Neceſſaries as are not clearly revealed in Scripture, *viz.* The Trinity, the Incarnation of our Saviour, and the obſervation of the Lord's Day.

Of the firſt of theſe he thus diſcourſes.

Addreſs. *For Example; Is the Belief of a* Trinity, *One God and Three Perſons, neceſſary to Salvation? If it be, as the Creed of S.* Athanaſius *aſſures us it is, in what Chapter and Verſe of Scripture is it clearly expreſſed? If you ſend me to the* 1 *Epiſt. of S.* John, *Chap.* 5. *Ver.* 7. *where we read,* There are Three who give Teſtimony in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and Holy Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One; *or to the Goſpel of S.* John, *Chap.* 10. *Ver.* 50. I and my Father are One; *I deſire you to ſhew clearly out of Scripture, that the word* One *here ſignifies a ſtrict Identity or Unity of Subſtance, as the Church of* England *holds; not a meer Moral Union, as many Learned* Arrians *and others will have it, and as we all confeſs the ſame word ſignifies in S.* John, *Chap.* 17. *Ver.* 21. *where our Lord Prays that all Believers may be* One, *as he and his Father*

are

are One; *where certainly he cannot be ſuppoſed to mean* One *in Subſtance. In what Verſe then and Chapter in Scripture have we theſe or the like words, The word* One *in the* 1 *Epiſt. of* S. John, *Item in* S. John's *Goſpel, ſignifies a ſtrict Identity; which notwithſtanding I conceive ought to be, if all Neceſſaries to Salvation be clearly contained in Scripture. Now if the Belief of a* Trinity *be not neceſſary to Salvation, I deſire it may be clearly owned in theſe or the like words:* 'Tis not neceſſary for Salvation to believe Three Perſons and one God, notwithſtanding the Creed of S. *Athanaſius*, and Definition of the firſt Council of *Nice*, when the Church was in her Purity, not the leaſt corrupted.

Anſwer. The ſum of our Author's Argument is this, That the Doctrine of the Trinity is not clearly contained in Scripture, becauſe Unity in ſome places ſignifies not a Unity of Eſſence, but of Will; which way of arguing ſuppoſes that if a word be taken in two or more different ſenſes, then the Scripture doth not clearly contain the things contained in thoſe words.

As for Example; the word, *Door*, is ſometimes taken in Scripture in a proper ſenſe, ſometimes in a Metaphorical; and being thus differently taken, we cannot according to him, certainly know when it is to be underſtood Properly, and when Metaphorically; and muſt be at a perfect loſs to underſtand, whether when our Saviour is called a *Door*, *John* 10. 7. it's not meant properly; and when St. *Peter* is ſaid to ſtand at the *Door*, *John* 18. 16. it's not meant Metaphorically. Or to come nearer to our Author, the *Body of Chriſt* is ſometimes taken for a Natural, ſometimes for a Myſtical Body; and therefore we cannot be certainly aſſured, whether when *Joſeph* begg'd the *Body* of Jeſus, it's not to be underſtood of the Myſti-

cal Body; and that when the Apostles and Prophets, *&c.* were *given for the edifying the Body of Christ*, Eph. 4. 11, 12. it's not to be understood of Christ's Natural Body.

In this so difficult a case, *which is absolutely necessary to be answer'd for the salvation of his Soul*, p. 4. (if you will believe the Addresser) What is to be done? What in reason will content him? It's nothing less than this, That it be shewn, that in some *Verse and Chapter in Scripture, we have these or the like words,——The Word* One *in* St. John's *Epistle, signifies a strict Identity:* And he might have gone on without end in the same way; and one as obstinate as himself, may say, Shew me some other Chapter and Verse, wherein it is said, that the word *Door*, *John* 10. is to be understood Metaphorically, and the word *Body*, *Ephes.* 4. is to be understood Mystically; or else it is apparent that we cannot know what *Door*, Proper or Metaphorical; or what *Body*, whether Natural or Mystical, is meant in those places; for, *This ought to be, if these things are clearly contained in Scripture.*

This is a Thought, for ought I know, peculiar to our Author, (for I don't find this *Address* comes out with other *Allowance*, than *Printed for R. Taylor*); and as I do not envy him the Glory of the Invention, so I shall leave him the satisfaction of self-enjoyment.

Indeed his Friends the *Learned Arrians* went not his way in opposing the Trinity, nor the Orthodox in defending it; and therefore if this Point was now to be argued, the Ministers of the Church of *England*, that hold with the Orthodox, and amongst other places produce this of 1 *John* 5. 7. for it, would say, that it's as plainly said, The Father, Word, and Holy Ghost are *One*, as that they are *Three*; and that tho Unity is sometimes taken in a Moral sense, as *John* 17. 21. yet the arguing of

St. *John*

St. *John* in the former place, ſhews it not to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe as the latter; he making a plain difference betwixt the Unity that is betwixt the *Three that bear record in Heaven*, and the *Three that bear witneſs in Earth*; for of the *Three* that bear Record in Heaven, it's ſaid, *They are one*; but of the *Three* that bear witneſs on Earth, it's ſaid, *They agree in One*. Now if it had been a mere Moral Union that was betwixt the Father, Word, and Holy Ghoſt (who are the *Three in Heaven*) it would have been as well ſaid of them, as of the Spirit, the Water and the Blood (which are *the Three in Earth*) that they *Agree in One*. In like manner would the Miniſters of the Church of *England* ſupport the proof of this Article from *John* 10. 30. *I and my Father are One*, and ſhew that it's to be underſtood of the Unity of Eſſence, and not of mere Will and Conſent; becauſe *the Jews took up Stones to ſtone him for blaſphemy, and becauſe that thou being a man, makeſt thy ſelf God.* But ſince there is a Union that may be betwixt God and Man without making man to be God, as it is *John* 17. 21. it follows that neither did our Saviour ſpeak, nor the *Jews* underſtand him to have ſpoken of a Moral, but a Natural Union; but for this let me recommend the *Addreſſer* to the Second Part of the *Dialogue concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation compared*, p. 10, 11. and Publiſhed the laſt Year.

His ſecond Inſtance is of the Incarnation; of which he ſaith,

Again, Is the Belief of the Incarnation *neceſſary for Salvation? Where is it clearly expreſſed in Scripture? You refer me to* S. John, *chap.* 1. The Word is made Fleſh. *But you know that many Learned Men,* Neſtorius *and others,* Addreſs.

denied

denied that word to signifie a strict Incarnation, but either a Moral Union, or a meer external appearance of a Man, as those who held Christ not to have a real but a phantastick Body. Now be pleased to shew me in what Verse or Chapter it is clearly expressed, that the said words signifie a strict Incarnation? But if you deny the belief of this Mystery to be necessary to Salvation, own it, for our satisfaction, in these or the like words: It is not necessary for Salvation to believe, that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity was made true Man. *And if the Belief of neither* Trinity *nor* Incarnation *are necessary, shew me what 'tis, and where expressed in Scripture.*

Answer. Setting aside what the Opinion of *Nestorius* was (which our Author for ought I perceive understands not) the sum of what is said, amounts to this, That the Scripture is not clear in this Point; because, as he saith, *Many learned Men*, Nestorius *and others, deny that word* [he means that phrase] *to signifie strict Incarnation.* So that if a learned Man, or learned Men dispute the Point, that Point so disputed, or the words expressing it, cannot be clear, or the Sense certain. But I have before shewed that this is no reason against the perspicuity of Scripture in such a case, because nothing can be clearer express'd than many of those things which are sometimes made matter of Disputation.

As what can be clearer, than that Christ had a Body *of Flesh and Bones?* Yet there were some of our Authors *Learned men*, that held Christ was *a meer external appearance of a man; and not to have a real, but a phantastic Body.* And the Ministers of the Church of *England*, notwithstanding the *denial* of his *learned Men*, do yet maintain the Incarnation of our blessed Saviour to be evidently delivered in the words, *The word was* (not *is*, as

as he miſtakes) *made Fleſh.* For who was the *Word*, but he that is called *God*, *ver.* 1. that made all things? *ver.* 3. And what was *his being made Fleſh*, but his being *made of* the Seed of *David? Rom.* 1. 3. And how was he made Fleſh, but by being united to it, and becoming Man? Now if the Word, that was God, was the Word and not Man, before he was made Fleſh; and when he was made Fleſh, did not ceaſe to be the Word, then there muſt be in him two Natures united, which is the Incarnation.

His 3*d* Inſtance is, as he ſaith, *in order to Practice*, and the Query upon it, is,

Addreſs. *Then in order to Practice, I deſire to know, whether it be neceſſary to Salvation, to keep holy the* Lord's-Day, *that is,* Sunday *and not* Saturday. *If it be, I deſire to know in what Chapter and Verſe it is clearly contained in Scripture; as alſo where the Abrogation of the* Saturday *is clearly expreſſed? If it be not neceſſary for Salvation to keep holy the* Lord's-Day, *I deſire your warrant for it in theſe or the like terms:* It is not neceſſary to keep holy the Lord's-Day, that is, Sunday.

Anſwer. To this I anſwer, That the obligation to obſerve *the Lord's-Day* is more or leſs neceſſary or unneceſſary, according to the Inſtitution of it; for ſuch as the Inſtitution is, ſuch is the Obligation. If it be of mere Humane and Eccleſiaſtical inſtitution, it may by the ſame Authority be altered as it was eſtabliſhed: If of Divine Inſtitution, it's not ſubject to humane arbitration. And if it be of Divine Inſtitution, we muſt have it by the Revelation in Scripture, or elſe it cannot be Divine. And that it's eſtabliſhed upon ſuch Authority, I ſhall offer theſe conſiderations:

1. There is as much in the Reason of the thing for this peculiar Day to be observed in the Christian Church, as there was for the *Sabbath* in the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish* Church; for what the Moral *Sabbath* was to Man upon his Creation, and the Ceremonial *Sabbath* was to the *Jews* upon their Deliverance out of *Egypt*, Deut. 5. 15. that is the *First Day of the Week*, or the *Lord's Day* to Christians, upon our Redemption by Christ, which was accomplished and testified in his Resurrection on that Day.

2. There is the Mark of Divine Institution set upon it, when that which was otherwise called *the first Day of the week*, was afterwards called *the Lord's Day*, Rev. 1. 10. It being usual in Scripture after that Times, Places, Things, and Persons were set apart for the Service of God by Divine Institution, to have his Name as a Mark of Propriety given to them: Thus we read of *the Lord's Passover*, Exod. 12. 11. *The Sabbath of the Lord*, Exod. 20. 10. *The Temple of the Lord. The Lord's Supper*, 1 Cor. 11. 20.

Now I know not what Reason can be assigned, that when the Things thus dignified by this Title, are elsewhere of Divine Institution, and so named because of that Institution; that this Day should be called the *Lord's Day*, and not be of Divine, but Humane Institution.

3. We may observe further, That as the New World of Redemption began upon that Day, so upon the same Day did Christ solemnly consecrate the Christian Church by the Descent of the Holy-Ghost upon the Apostles, *Acts* 2. 1, 2. (as of old, the *Jewish* Church was by a Cloud or Divine Appearance, *Exod.* 40. 34. 1 *Kings* 8. 10, 11.) which they had the Promise of, and until which, they were not to depart from *Jerusalem*, and to enter upon the work of gathering a Church, *Acts* 1. 4.

4. It

4. It was the Day which the Primitive Chriſtians in the Apoſtolical times held their ſtated Aſſemblies upon for Divine Worſhip; as appears *Acts* 20. 7. 1 *Cor.* 16. 2.

This may ſuffice for the firſt branch of his Query, *I deſire to know in what Chapter and Verſe it is clearly contained in Scripture.*

His next is, *Where the Abrogation of the* Saturday [he means the Sabbath] *is clearly expreſſed?* I may anſwer him, it's *in* the ſame *Chapter* and *Verſe* where *the Abrogation of* Circumciſion *is clearly expreſſed.* And when he can find out *Chapter and Verſe for* the one, I will undertake to ſhew him *Chapter and Verſe* for the other. Indeed there was no need of an expreſs *Abrogation* of either; For Baptiſm being inſtituted by Chriſt as a means of Initiation into his Church; Circumciſion that was the old way of admiſſion, muſt fall in courſe, becauſe the one was inconſiſtent with the other. So *the Lord's Day* being ſet a-part for the publick and ſolemn Worſhip of God in the Chriſtian Church, the Sabbath that was before appointed for it, muſt in reaſon ſurrender to it. So the Apoſtle, *Col.* 2. 16, 17. *Let no man judge you in meat, or drink, or in reſpect of an holy-day, or of new-moons, or of the ſabbath* [*days*] *which are a ſhadow of things to come, but the body is of Chriſt.* Where the word, σαββάτων, tho in the plural, ſignifies the Seventh day, or Jewiſh Sabbath, as it doth *Matt.* 25. 10, 12. and for the moſt part in the *New-Teſtament*: And which being *a ſhadow*, as well as *Meats and Drinks*, *Holy-days* and *New-Moons*, was with thoſe, and for the ſame reaſons, to ceaſe by the coming of Chriſt.

Now, as the Inſtitution of Baptiſm abrogated Circumciſion, and *the Lord's Day* abrogated *the Sabbath*; ſo we may certainly infer, that if the Sabbath was *a ſhadow*, and abrogated as ſuch (which the Apoſtle here

asserts) that there was some other day instituted in the place of it; (these things mutually inferring each other) and what that day is, I may leave to our Author's guess, without again going to *Chapter and Verse.*

Q. 4. Address. *If you say that every one is only bound to believe what is clear to him in Scripture, reading it with Sincerity and Humility; then I must desire to know, What if I, reading Scripture* Sincerely *and with* Humility, *cannot find clearly expressed either the* Trinity *or* Incarnation? *will it not be necessary for the Salvation of my Soul to believe these two Mysteries?*

Answer. I Answer,

1. *Sincerity* and *Humility*, do imply the due use of all the means a person hath in possession, for the finding out the Truth; such as diligent reading the Word of God, Prayers, and Consultation with such as are most able and fit to assist him: And where this temper is, and this course is taken, there will never be wanting what is necessary. *John* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self.*

2. No man can believe but according to the motives of credibility, and the reasons he hath for his Faith. An obligation lies upon all to believe all things necessary to Salvation; but that is when they are proposed: and according to the Evidence, so we are to believe, and so only we can. And yet we do not say as this Writer words it, That *Every one is only Bound to believe what is clear to him in Scripture.* For the Obligation to believe, doth not depend upon his Understanding, but the Authority of the Revelation; his want of understanding may be taken as an excuse for his want of Faith, but doth not diminish his obligation to believe.

3. No

3. No man ſhall anſwer for what he had not a power to do; and if he wants the Means, or fails of the End in a due uſe of thoſe Means, it ſhall not be imputed to him, *John* 15. 22. *If I had not come and ſpoken unto them, they had not had ſin.* I do not queſtion, but as he that is truly ſincere would believe if he was able, and could ſee into the ſtrength of evidence for it, ſo that this ingenuous diſpoſition of mind will be a reaſon for Almighty God to give him that Faith which is neceſſary, or to pardon the want of it; and if I was to chuſe, I had rather be ſincere and err in a Matter of Faith, than believe upon the full Conviction of the Truth, and yet not be ſincere in the profeſſion of it; being ſenſible that what is involuntary is a leſs ſin than what is voluntary; and that I ſhall ſuffer leſs for a fault in my Underſtanding, which I could not help, than for a fault in my Will, which I might. Therefore let a perſon firſt learn *Sincerity* and *Humility*, and *read the Scripture ſincerely and with Humility*, and then he will be ſure to find all Truths neceſſary to Salvation, ſo clearly and ſufficiently expreſſed therein, that he will be thereby convinced of it; or if he fail in it, he may be ſure his *Sincerity* and *Humility* will do more through the Grace and Mercy of God in Chriſt to ſave him, than the want of a Belief of ſome things otherwiſe neceſſary, can do to damn him.

Put the Caſe I have recourſe (as by theſe I have) to Church Guides, *and they tell me I muſt believe thoſe Myſteries: Is it neceſſary I believe theſe Guides? If it be, then Scripture alone is not clear in Neceſſaries to Salvation; for here I am obliged to believe what is not clear to me in Scripture. Again, am I bound to keep holy* Sunday, *tho I find no Precept for it in Scripture, and not* Saturday, *tho I find an expreſs Command for it, no-where Abrogated* Addreſs.

in

in Scripture, because my Guides *tell me I must do so? If I must, then* Guides *are necessary to Salvation, and Scripture alone without them is not sufficient. Be pleased to own this Proposition* —— Scripture alone is not sufficient, without Guides to Interpret it. *If notwithstanding my* Guides, *I am not bound to believe either* Trinity *or* Incarnation, *or observe* Sunday, *then I must beg of you to warrant with your Authority these words:* I am not bound to keep holy the Lord's-Day or Sunday, tho the *Guides* of the Church tell me I must, if I cannnot find it clearly in Scripture.

But you tell me, That Necessaries to Salvation are either clear in Scripture, or evidently deduced out of Scripture. Very well. Assign then these Necessaries, and deduce them out of Scripture; shew the Verse and Chapter from whence is evidently deduced an Obligation to keep holy Sunday *and not* Saturday. *Again, the Evidence of that Deduction is either had immediately from the meer reading of Scripture, without help of* Guides, *and then I desire to see the Places from whence these Necessaries are evidently inferr'd; or it cannot be had but by the help of* Guides, *and then the Scripture alone is not sufficient.*

Answer. What he here saith concerning *Church-Guides*, and *Deductions* from Scripture, has been before in good part prevented, and shall have a farther Reply. But I cannot but observe, before I proceed, how our Author doth all along rather design to amuse his Reader, than to come to the Point; of which there is not a Paragraph, but is an Evidence. As for Instance,

1. He thus argues, *If all things necessary to Salvation are contained in Scripture, then they are either clearly contained in it, so that there is no need of an Interpreter for the*

the meaning of the words, or not, p. 1. Now he cannot but know, that *an Interpreter for the meaning of the words*, is no more denied by us, than it is ſufficient for them; without he underſtands more by *Meaning of the Words*, than he cared his Reader ſhould at firſt perceive.

2. He argues again, *Put the caſe I have recourſe to Church-Guides, and they tell me I muſt believe thoſe Myſteries; is it Neceſſary I believe thoſe* Guides? —— *Am I bound becauſe my Guides tell me I muſt do ſo?* Now he knows that ſuch *Guides* as *it's neceſſary to believe*, are the Guides they indeed would have, but we deny.

3. He proceeds, *The evidence of the Deduction is either had immediately from the mere reading of Scripture, without help of Guides; or* &c. Now who ever ſaid, that all Neceſſaries are to be learned by all perſons by *the mere reading of Scripture* without the uſe of Means, ſuch as Attention, Conſideration, Prayer, Interpreters, and Guides?

4. He then infers fallaciouſly, *Or it cannot be had but by the help of Guides, and then the Scripture alone is not ſufficient*: For when the Scripture *alone* is ſaid to be *ſufficient*, it's meant ſo as to contain all things neceſſary to Salvation; it's ſufficient as a Rule for all things belonging to Faith and Manners, ſo as to exclude the Neceſſity of any other Rule of that kind: But it's not ſo *alone ſufficient* as to exclude all Means by which it's to be underſtood.

5. He farther conceals himſelf, when after he had applied the caſe to *Church-Guides*, as if he would be underſtood of private and ordinary Teachers in the Church, he at laſt lodges it in the boſom of ſome ſtated and univerſal Infallible and unerring Guide, as in the next Queſtion.

Address. Secondly, *But if all Necessaries to Salvation be not clear enough in Scripture to be understood without an Interpreter, then it will be necessary to know who and where the Interpreter is. If you remit me to the Decision of the true Church, it will be necessary to know which is that Church. If you tell me all Christian Churches joined together, then it follows that I am bound to believe nothing but what all Christians agree in; for what they disagree in, cannot be the Sentiment or Decision of the whole Church, but only of a part of it. I am not then obliged to believe the* Trinity; *for the* Arians, *tho Christians, deny it. I am not obliged to believe the* Incarnation, *for many Christians deny that Christ was God made Man by a strict Incarnation, but only by a Moral Union; that is, he was a Man who had the Authority of God, as his Plenipotentiary, and the like. Now then let me know on what all Christians agree, and let me have your Warrant that I am bound to believe neither the* Trinity *nor* Incarnation, *nor any thing wherein all Christians do not agree. Now if you tell me I am obliged to stand to the Determination of one particular Church, or some and not all, tell me which, and why that or those more than others? What Church, for Example, were particular Persons bound to follow Two hundred years ago before the* Reformation?

Answer. Our Author at first put the Question, *Whether all things necessary to Salvation are contained in Scripture?* And upon this he argues, *If they be, then they are either clearly contained in it, so that there is no need of an Interpreter for the meaning of them, or not.* If the Addresser could have gained the first Point, That *all necessaries are not contained in Scripture*, then the Case lay fair before him, and it would follow (as he supposes) that there must be some external and speaking Authority from whence those Necessaries *not contained in Scripture*, are to be

be received, and where they are to be sought: This is a Case he puts to the Question, *If not, where must I seek them?* But there he leaves it: Indeed it was a tender Point, because of late they would have us believe that they have Scripture for what they differ from us in; and then to talk of Necessaries not to be found in Scripture, and to instance in those Necessaries, would be to give up that Cause which they have so much laboured to support in that way; and to tell the World that the Church of *Rome* is the Treasurer of all those Necessaries, is a Doctrine not so suitable to the Genius of the present Age, as it was to others heretofore.

But if that would not be yielded, That *all Necessaries are not contained in Scripture*, he then puts in with a Second, That *they are not so Clearly contained in it, as not to need an Interpreter*; and if this be yielded, he would in his own opinion, save his Cause; for then he concludes there must be some Guide and Interpreter, and *it will be necessary to know who and where the Interpreter is.* Now if we may guess what kind of Interpreter or Guide it is that he would have, it's one that is necessary for all to believe, and whose Interpretation all are obliged to receive; a Guide that is a Judg, and whose Judgment is absolute, final, and conclusive, into which all is to be resolved, and from which there is no appeal; that is to teach *all Necessaries to Salvation not contained in Scripture*; and to interpret the meaning of those that are; without which we cannot know whether there be a Trinity, or our Saviour was Incarnate; and upon whose determination all the Articles of our Faith do depend for their declaration. Here the Case is immutably fixed, says our Author, *I must believe*; *it's necessary to believe*; *I am obliged to believe, and am bound to follow*; as he puts the Case.

But now we that are for Ministerial Guides and Interpreters that are appointed by God for the teaching his Church, and whose Office it is to teach them so as they may understand and judg for themselves, know nothing of such a Guide as he would introduce upon us; and we have reason to be cautious, when we find both the Apostle declaring against it, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Not for that we have dominion over your Faith, but are helpers*; and our Saviour warning us against such an Imposition, *Matth.* 23. 8, 9, 10. *Call no man master on earth, for one is your master.* It's his Prerogative alone to challenge such an absolute submission from us; and it's a gross Usurpation in any other to claim and assume it: So that we may leave our Author to find out, *Who, and where the Interpreter is*; for we own no such Guide or Interpreter as he would impose upon us, whether he means by it any particular Church, or any part or Society of that Church, or indeed any humane Authority whatsoever. And when he or his Partizans think it worth the while to undertake the proof of it, and shall as clearly prove it as the Trinity and Incarnation are from Scripture; we that profess the latter, and are as *sincerely desirous of finding out the Truth* as he can be, do promise him to own the former; and for this Reason, and that they may have a fair occasion offered to try their skill upon it, I shall put the Case a little forward.

I am sensible our Author would take it in good part to have it granted that all things necessary to Salvation are not contained in Scripture, and to have it brought to his first Question, *If so, where must I seek them?* Or that, They are *not clear enough in Scripture without an Interpreter*; that at least the next Question may be brought on, *Who, and where the Interpreter is?* And therefore to gratifie him as much as I can, I shall for the present

suppose that all things necessary are not in Scripture; and then in his order and words, I ask, *What those necessaries to Salvation are, that are not contained in Scripture, and where each of them may be found?* Now he that supposes this, must proceed upon the Principles of the Church of *Rome* (since no Church besides, that I know of, is of this mind.) And whither may we expect to be directed so soon as to the Creed of Pope *Pius* IV. which contains the chief of those Doctrines they differ from other Churches in, and which are made as necessary to be received and believed, as the Articles of the *Nicene* Creed, being by that Pope's Authority, in consequence of the Order of the Council of *Trent*, incorporated into one and the same *Profession of Faith*. By which means they are forced upon one of these two Difficulties, either to prove their new-coined Articles by Scripture as well as those of the *Nicene* Creed; or to show that the Articles of the *Nicene* Creed are no more to be proved from Scripture, without Tradition and the Churches Explication, than those of Pope *Pius*: The former they are never able to do, and all their attempts that way have proved vain and unsuccessful; and therefore they have taken several ways for the latter, sometimes detracting from the Sufficiency or Perspicuity of Scripture, at other times exalting Tradition, and Church-Authority to an equality with it. For since all these Points are made by this means equally necessary to Salvation; and since it's as necessary to believe on pain of Damnation, That *the Church of* Rome *is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches*; and that *the Body and Blood of Christ are truly, really, and substantially, together with his Soul and Divinity, in the Sacrament, and the whole Substance of the Bread is turned into the Body, and the whole Substance of the Wine into his Blood*, &c. Since it's as necessary to believe this, as the

Being of a God, the Trinity, and Incarnation of our Blessed Saviour, and that they are sensible they are not to be proved in the same way, they find themselves obliged to give the same Authority to one as the other, and to bring down the Scripture to the Church, or exalt the Church to the Authority of Scripture. So that if we will look for things necessary, not contained in Scripture, we must have recourse to the Church, which can, as they say, ordain new Articles of Faith, and which whenever so ordained are as much to be believed and received as those which have their Authority immediately from Scripture. And after our Author hath beat about, and done his endeavour to loosen the Articles of our Faith from the written Revelation, and *the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles*; hither he would bring the Case, that we are *obliged to stand to the Determination of one particular Church*, as he insinuates, *page* 4.

But now to return his own words upon him, *If you remit me to the Decision of the true Church, it will be necessary to know which is that Church.* For since there are several pretenders, and there are *Christian Arrians*, as he saith, and many other Dissenters, how shall I find out this True Church, and *why that more than others?* Is it because she her self saith she is the True Church? All the rest claim the like Character of being a True Church; and besides, this is to demand the thing that is to be proved. Is it that she is like a City upon an Hill, or the Sun in the Firmament, to be known by a self-evident Light? Why is it not then as well known, and indisputably owned to be the true Church, and the only True Church, as a City to be a City, or the Sun to be the Sun? Is it to be found out by the Notes and Marks of the True Church? Then we must find out the Marks before we find out the Church that is to be known by them.

them. And then the pinching Queſtion comes on, *Where muſt I ſeek* theſe Notes? It's to be feared that will lead us to the Scripture, and then we know what follows. Laſtly, Are we to find out the Church by an Infallible Guide? Then we are to find ſuch a Guide out of the Church; and that we have no direction where to ſeek, or by what Notes we may know it. Here indeed we are left in a Maze to beat out the way, and they that have made the Church a Guide, have appointed no Guide to lead us to the Church. That is a Track we muſt find of our ſelves, there we muſt uſe our own ſimple Reaſon, Conſideration, and Enquiry. So that how certain ſoever we may be when in the Church, we can never be infallibly certain which is the Church that *we are bound to follow*; becauſe this kind of certainty is peculiar to the Church, and not to be had out of it.

But ſince we have gone thus far upon Suppoſition, let us take it for granted once more, that the Church is upon the Hill viſible and demonſtrable, yet becauſe the Church is a Collective Body, where is the Seat of that Infallible Authority, that I am to attend to, and finally to be determined by? Is it in every particular perſon? Then becauſe Infallibility knows no degrees, I my ſelf ſhould in that Church be as Infallible as the Supreme Paſtor of it. Is it in one particular perſon, or in a General Council? *Who, and where is it?* Muſt I ſuſpend till I know, or till all the parts of the Church agree in it? If you tell me *all joyned together* (as our Author has taught me to Reaſon) *then it follows I am bound to believe nothing* of this kind, *but what all agree in; for what they diſagree in, cannot be the Sentiment or Deciſion of the whole Church, but only of a part of it. I am not then obliged to believe* the Pope's Infallibility; for the Councils

cils of *Basil* and *Constance*, and the *French* Church, *tho* Papists *deny it*. Nor am I *obliged to believe* a Council Infallible without the Pope, because those at *Rome deny it*. And because what's a good Argument in one case, is good in another; let me have our Author's *Warrant*, *that I am bound to believe neither* Infallible, since neither of these agree with the other. For certainly I am no more *obliged to believe the* Infallibility of their Church, which they do thus disagree in, than our Author would perswade us that we are *not obliged to believe the Trinity*, because *the Arrians*, *tho Christians*, *deny it*. But supposing that the Seat of Infallibility be clear and evident; Yet how can I, that am at a vast distance of years or place from that Oracle, whatever it is, be infallibly assured that these that are put into my hands are the very Results and Decrees of that Authority? Or that this that I think, or am told, is the true and undoubted sense of them? Or (to speak modestly) How can I be as much assured of the Truth of these matters, as I am of the Authority and Sence of Scripture? Or that Christ hath not spoken as plainly and intelligibly in the Scriptures, as his Vicar or Substitutes have in any of their Canons and Decrees? So that tho the Church be Infallible, and I a Member of that Infallible Church; yet what will that Infallibility avail me, when I am without the doors of that Infallible Council, or out of the reach of the immediate Dictates of the Infallible Chair? And unless the spirit of Infallibility descends from the Chair to the meanest Priest who is to instruct and direct me; or is indorsed upon every Decree, and inspires every Article with its own unerring sense; I am not infallibly certain. And I may be no more certain of the true Doctrine of the Infallible Church, than I am of the sense of Scripture under the Conduct of a Fallible Church; since the im-

immediate Authority I depend upon for the Doctrine, and the Sense of it, is all this while Fallible. As for example, I am told that there is such a Creed as that before mentioned of Pope *Pius* IV. that contains in it such Articles that every one is so bound to believe, as *without the belief of which no Man can be saved:* And I find in that Creed, that the *Church of* Rome *is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.* And yet how shall I be Infallibly assured, first, that there ever was such a person as Pope *Pius* the 4th? or that he ever composed such a Creed? or that the foresaid Supremacy of the Church of *Rome* is one of those Articles? The Pope I never saw, nor am like to see. A Council is a rare thing, and what they care not to hear of at *Rome*, and are able to do as well without as with it. And therefore where shall I be infallibly instructed in these matters? How shall I then be sure that the Article aforesaid is not to be understood, that *the Church of* Rome *is the Mistress* of all Churches within the particular Dioces of *Rome* only? For here is a different use of the same Word; and if, in our Author's way of Arguing, a different use of the same word will render us uncapable of attaining the sense contained in these words, it would be to little purpose to read the word without an Infallible Assistant always at hand to explain it clearly and certainly to us. So that if there be no better *way to end the many Controversies of this Age*, than what he calls *the only and surest way*, they are likely to continue for his time. And if their Church has no *surer* way to bring the Case to an issue, than this of exposing Christianity to save themselves, they will as soon make men to quit all Religion, as that which they have, to be of theirs, of which they cannot be, but by subverting those Principles upon which the best Religion in the World, the Christian, is supported.

Here

Here I might have concluded; but our Author may take it ill, if after I have traced him from Paragraph to Paragraph, I should leave out his pathetical Conclusion, which is as follows:

Address. *I conceive, an Answer to these Doubts absolutely necessary for the Salvation of my Soul. For how can I be saved, if I know not what is necessary thereunto? I need not say a satisfactory one, for no other can flow from your Learned and virtuous Pens; I only fear that some Pin-feather'd Divine, out of an itch to appear in Print, may prevent yours, and put me off with a Flim-flam, or an uncharitable Jeer, or Railing against some particular Church he may fancy me to be of, which is nothing to my purpose, who seek where I may find securely Necessaries to Salvation, not where I cannot find them. This would be also prejudicial to the Church of* England; *for when Men see Doubts so sincerely and submissively Proposed, Answered only with Jeers, Railing and Invectives, or omitted and let pass, as not deserving an Answer, they must needs doubt of the Learning ae well as of the Virtue and Charity of their Leaders.*

Now were the Satisfaction I here desire, intended for my self alone, it might have seemed more proper to have made my Address in particular to some one of your Reverend and Learned Body; but forasmuch as it concerns so many others, and as I perswade my self, will prove extremely beneficial to Religion, it being the surest, nay only way to end the many Controversies of this Age, I am forced to desire of you, whose high Character obliges you to a Zeal of Souls, a publick, and withal a speedy Answer, by which you will highly oblige,

SIRS,

Yours ever.

LONDON: Printed for *Randall Taylor*, 1688.

Our

Our Author has too plainly diſcovered himſelf, and had reaſon to ſuppoſe his Reader might *well fancy him to be of ſome particular Church*; and he may as well expect to receive a due Correction for this his Diſſimulation, that pretends to be in doubt, and yet to be in a Church (as he ſuppoſes) Infallible; that pretends *the Anſwer to theſe Doubts abſolutely neceſſary for the Salvation of his Soul*, and yet is of a Church in which he is judged to hazard his Soul if he doth but doubt; that Preſents *An Addreſs to the Miniſters of the Church of* England, to reſolve his Doubts, and yet has a Guide of his own whom *it's neceſſary to believe*, and whom he *is bound to follow*; that pretends to be *ſincerely deſirous of finding out the Truth*, and doth all he can to involve it: Laſtly, that brings theſe very Doubts to the Miniſters of the Church of *England*, that have been of late ſo frequently anſwered by them, to the Confutation, tho, it ſeems, not altogether to the Silencing of their Adverſaries. I will direct him to the Books, and I hope by way of Courteſie he will in his next direct us to the Anſwers that have been ſince returned to them.

The Peoples Right to Read the Holy Scripture, in Anſwer to the Repreſenter.

A Diſcourſe concerning a Guide.

A Vindication of the Anſwer to ſome late Papers. Page 40, &c.

An Anſwer to a late Dialogue, between a New Catholick Convert, and a Proteſtant, to prove the Myſtery of the Trinity, &c.

The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared, &c. in 2 parts.

An Answer to the Request to Protestants to produce plain Scriptures, &c.

With the Vindication of it, called, *A Short Summary of the principal Controversies.*

An Answer to a Book Entituled, Reason and Authority. Page 1, 2, &c.

The Difference betwixt the Protestant and Socinian Methods, in Answer to the *Potestant's Plea* for *a Socinian.*

All these Books, with several others to the same purpurpose, were Printed the last year; and if our Author had consulted them, as he ought, and had as *sincerely* read them, as he pretends to *propose* his *doubts*; whatever his Confidence might, I am apt to think his Conscience would not have found any just occasion to have made this *Address*, nor needed Another to Answer it.

But it seems nothing less will satisfy our Author, than an Answer from *the Ministers of the Church of* England. It's not a *particular* person that he conceives sufficiently qualified to undertake his Case, and to rescue his *Soul*, which he is so *solicitous to save* out of this danger; and *to instruct him in this weighty Affair.* But it is *their Reverend and Learned Body* (as he fleeringly stiles them) that he presents his *Address* to; from whom he expects a *Publick, and withal a Speedy Answer.* He writes as if they were now in Convocation, or that they were all obliged through the Two Provinces forthwith to assemble about this important Case; and by one Solemn Act of theirs,

to

to return *an Anſwer to theſe Doubts, which is abſolutely neceſſary for the Salvation* of his *Soul.* But becauſe it's now not a ſeaſon for this purpoſe, and 'twill be too long to ſtay till the days grow longer, and the ways better, I thought I might as well preſume to try what might be done by a private hand, and he might as well accept of it, as he might *Preſent an Addreſs to the Miniſters of the Church of* England, *in behalf of himſelf and others,* and at laſt ſubſcribe in his own name with a, *Sirs, Yours ever.*

FINIS.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

A Diſcourſe of the *Holy Euchariſt* in the two great Points of the *Real Preſence*, and the *Adoration of the Hoſt*; in Anſwer to the *Two Diſcourſes* lately Printed at *Oxford* on this Subject: To which is prefixed a large Hiſtorical Preface relating to the ſame Argument.

Two Diſcourſes; Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

The Fifteen *Notes* of the *Church*, as laid down by Cardinal *Bellarmin* examined and confuted. 4o. With a Table to the Whole.

Preparation for Death: Being a Letter ſent to a young Gentlewoman in *France*, in a dangerous Diſtemper of which ſhe died. By *W. Wake*, M. A. 12o.

The Difference between the *Church of England* and the *Church of Rome*, in oppoſition to a late Book, Intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of* England *and Church of* Rome.

A *Private Prayer* to be uſed in difficult Times.

A True Account of a Conference held about Religion at *London*, *Sept.* 29. 1687. between *A. Pulton*, Jeſuit, and *Th. Teniſon*, D. D. as alſo of that which led to it, and followed after it. 4o.

The Vindication of *A. Creſſener*, Schoolmaſter in *Long-Acre*, from the Aſperſions of *A. Pulton*, Jeſuit, Schoolmaſter in the *Savoy*, together with ſome Account of his Diſcourſe with Mr. *Meredith*.

A Diſcourſe ſhewing that Proteſtants are on the ſafer Side, notwithſtanding the uncharitable Judgment of thier Adverſaries; and that *Their Religion* is the ſureſt Way to Heaven. 4o.

Six Conferences concerning the *Euchariſt*, wherein is ſhewed, that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* overthrows the Proofs of Chriſtian Religion.

A Diſcourſe concerning the pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*; with an Account of the Occaſions and Beginnings of it in the Weſtern Church. In Three Parts. With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Biſhop of *Condom*.

The Pamphlet entituled, *Speculum Eccleſiaſticum*, or an Eccleſiaſtical Proſpective-Glaſs, conſidered, in its Falſe Reaſonings and Quotations. There are added, by way of Preface, two further Anſwers, the Firſt, to the Defender of the *Speculum*; the Second to the Half-ſheet againſt the *Six Conferences*.

A *Second Defence* of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, againſt the new Exceptions of *Monſ. de Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. The FIRST PART. In which the Account that has been given of the Biſhop of *Meaux's* Expoſition, is fully Vindicated; the Diſtinction of Old and New Popery *Hiſtorically* aſſerted, and the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in Point of *Image-worſhip*, more particularly conſidered. 4o.

A *Second Defence* of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, againſt the New Exceptions of *Monſ. de Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. The SECOND PART.

The Incurable Scepticiſm of the Church of *Rome*. By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Euchariſt*] 4o.

Mr. *Pulton* Conſidered in his Sincerity, Reaſonings, Authorities: Or a Juſt Anſwer to what he hath hitherto publiſhed in his *True Account*; his *True and Full Account of a Conference*, &c. His *Remarks*; and in them his pretended Confutation of what he calls Dr. T's *Rule of Faith*. By *Th. Teniſon*, D. D.

A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the *Ancient Church* relating to the *Euchariſt*, wholly different from thoſe of the *Preſent Roman Church*, and inconſiſtent with the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Being a ſufficient Confuration of *Conſenſus Veterum*, *Nubes Teſtium*, and other late *Collections* of the *Fathers* pretending to the Contrary. 4o

An Anſwer to the *Repreſenter's* Reflections upon the *State* and *View* of the